



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Toshiyuki SAKURAI et al.**

Group Art Unit: **2143**

Serial Number: **09/987,017**

Examiner: **Joseph E. Avellino**

Filed: **November 13, 2001**

Confirmation Number: **6353**

For: **LINKAGE SYSTEM FOR MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS**

Attorney Docket Number: **011441**

Customer Number: **38834**

SUBMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

November 29, 2005

Sir:

This Submission is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114.

The Advisory Action mailed November 16, 2005 includes a statement that applicants' arguments filed September 29, 2005 have been fully considered. However, the Advisory Action only provides comments on the subject of the obviousness rejections. There is no discussion of whether the amendments overcome the rejections based on non-statutory subject matter or on indefiniteness.

Accordingly, applicants file the present RCE to obtain full consideration of the arguments filed September 29, 2005. If the PTO does not deem any of the arguments persuasive, applicants request that the next Office Action fully explain the supposed fallacies.

Also, applicants again traverse the obviousness rejection. This rejection relies on Akers et al. to suggest modifying the Berman et al. system so that it would then have an inquiry file